में पड़ गया है ऐसा कई जगहों पर होता है। जहां पर डैम बनाया जाता है वहां पर हर काम में विलम्ब होकर उसका खर्चा इतना बढ़ जाता है कि उस काम को पूरा करने में दिक्कत हो जाती है। 423 करोड़ रुपए की यह ओरिजनल योजना थी। मंत्री जी यह बतायेंगे कि 1991 में यह योजना पूरी हो जाएगी या नहीं? अगर पूरी हो जाएगी तो उस पर कितना खर्चा होगा? तब हमारे पास कितने रिसोर्सेज होंगे? तो हमारे देश की योजनाओं को आप इस तरह से चलाएंगे तो जितनी भी नदियां हैं उन पर जो बांध बन रहे हैं उनके पूरा न होने से जो नुकसान होता है उसके लिये किसको आप जिम्मेदार ठहराएंगे? जब वक्त पर काम नहीं होता है तो क्यों नहीं होता है? अगर सही नहीं होता है तो उनके खिलाफ क्या कार्यवाही करेंगे? इसी तरह से हर एक नदी घाटी योजना अगर 5-10 साल देर से पूरी पूरी होगी तो देश आगे नहीं बढ़ सकता।

यह ठीक है कि जो काम कुछ सूबों में हो सका है, इरिगेशन हुआ है, वहां कुछ पैदावार भी हुई है और उत्पादन भी बढ़ सका है। बाकी जो प्रदेश है वहां अभी तक योजनाओं में विलम्ब होने से हमारा ऐग्रिकल्चरल प्रोडक्शन बहुत कम हुआ है। अगर हमारा ऐग्रिकल्चरल प्रोडक्शन ज्यादा होता तो हमारी नेशनल इनकम ज्यादा होती हमारी नेशनल ग्रोथ ज्यादा होती। हमारे और प्रदेश भी आगे बढ़ सकते। हमारे यहां नर्मदा रिवर योजना है। अभी प्रधान मंत्री जी ने उसकी क्लियरेंस दी है। लेकिन अगर 20 साल पहले उसकी स्वीकृति मिल जाती तो 3-4 करोड़ रु० बच जाता। 3-4 करोड़ रुपये की हमारी ऐग्रिकल्चरल प्रोडक्शन बढ़ जाती। लेकिन जो योजना 500 या 700 करोड़ रुपये में पूरी होने वाली थी वह 7 हजार करोड़ में भी पूरी नहीं होगी।

रिसोर्सेज कहां से इकठ्ठे करेंगे 12 हजार करोड़ रुपये लेने के लिए

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN ( SHRI GHULAM RASOOL MATTO): Mr. Patel, you can continue on the next occasion. It is time now to take up the Half-An-Hour Discussion.

5 P.M.

## HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION ON POINTS ARISING OUT OF ANSWER GIVEN TO STARRED QUESTION 123 ON 23RD APRIL 1987 RE. CREDIT TO M/S. RELIANCE INDUSTRIES LIMITED

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI GHULAM RASOOL MATTO): Now we shall take up the Half-an-Hour Discussion. But in the beginning I would like to tell the honourable Members that there must be a difference between a Half-an Hour Discussion and a Short Duration Discussion. They must confine themselves to the time-limit; of course, it cannot be only half an hour but as far as possible, they should not convert it into a Short Duration Discussion. As per the traditions of this House it is not possible to conclude the discussion within half an hour. But, as I said, Members must distinguish between Half-an-Hour Discussion and Short Duration Discussion. So, within the time-limit they should try to make their observations so that the discussion is completed in half an hour as far as possible. Now I request Shri Jaswant Singh to raise the discussion.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): Mr. Vice-Chairman, this discussion arises out of answers given to Question No. 123 on 23rd April 1987. The question itself was quite specific. There is no need to repeat the question. There is, however, every need very briefly to repeat what the Minister replied in the House on that day. I am not going into the full reply. Amongest many other things that the Minister of State said, he said the CBI had registered a case on 18th November 1985. Then, amongest other things, the honourable Minister of State said that banks and financial institutions provided credit facilities on need-based requirements which were extended to Messrs. Reliance Industries Limited after obtaiing the authorisation of RBI under Credit Authorisa-

[Shri Jaswant Singh]

tion Scheme. The very first difficulty that I have in the points arising out of this reply is what is the actual reply of the honourable Minister about the CBI case. This is a very intriguing aspect because the honourable Minister said in his reply to me on 23rd April 1987 that the CBI had registered a case on 18th November 1985, yet, on 19th March 1987 to a question raised to the Prime Minister by me the Prime Minister replied, "The Central Bureau of Investigation have reported that "investigation of the case has been completed, the investigation report is now under examination". There is an obvious discrepancy between these two, because in March 1987 I am informed by the Prime Minister, I am informed to a question raised by me, that the CBI investigation report is now under consideration; on 23rd April 1987 the honourable Minister of State said that the case has been registered on 18th November 1985. Now, here again, either the Prime Minister was wrong or the honourable Minister of State was wrong. Both replies given by the same Government, written replies, cannot be correct. Then the honourable Minister of State in the course of supplementaries asked on that day says: "So far as this question is concerned, it relates to a CBI inquiry against Messrs. Reliance Industries Limited; here I would like to bring to the notice of he honourable Member that a CBI case has been registered; the investigation is in progress and unless the final report under Section 173 is filed in the court of law, I am not in a position to disclose anything to the honourable Member." This is now the third version. First the version has come that the case was registered in November 1985; the second version is when the Prime Minister says, "The CBI report is under investigation", and the third is the whole case is now filed because it is 173 and I cannot give you any reply. Thereafter, the honourable Minister goes further to confuse the issue by saying that all these aspects would be looked into by the CBI and if any person has committeed any offence, he will be prosecuted and action will be taken. Where does the CBI come in when the Prime Minister says that the investigation is under examination? The honourable Minister of State goes further to confuse the issue when he says, "The CBI has registered a case.", and, after that, he says, "What type of loans, etc. have been given is a matter which is *sub judice* and I will come to that a little later.", at which point the Prime Minister intervenes to shed his light about his thinking and says that this Governmnet is very clear and it will punish the guilty, etc. Again, I point out that there is discrepancy between what the various Ministers are saying even on as small an aspect as a CBI case on which there are three different versions and one is in conflict with the other and Mr. Poojari is insistent on the fourth and not content with the third, he goes further and, on the same day, to the same supplementary, he says, "So far as the investigation is concerned, it is not completed and what amount has been given, by whom it has been given, whether any backdating is there, backdating of the letter of credit, whether any offence has been committed at all, all these would be investigtaed by the CBI investigating officer." Now, this is further confounding the matter because in the course of the same day, to the same question, he says this and this is the fourth version and, as if not content with that, the honourable Minister gives the fifth version wherein he says, "When a *prirma facie* case is going to be established, definitely we will take action.". Now, we have moved from "A CBI case is registered.", to "The investigation is not complete.", then to "When *Prima facie* case is established, we will take action." to "No case has been filed against any particular individual." and then to "Nowthere is an FIR." The very same honourable Minister has brought in the FIR. I am reading out from his replies. "So far as the CBI is concerned, if the CBI is going to file any charges against any officer, definitely we will take action.". All these are very confusing because the Government itself is very confused. These are all on the record of the House, parliamentary record, and here, though I have studied them all, I am not even referring to the replies given to exactly the same question

in the other House because it is sufficiently confusing to go through the replies given even in this House. I go on, Sir, because this is a very important matter. Now, this is my first question: Would the honourable Minister please clarify what this confusion about the CBI case is. The Prime Minister says one thing and the honourable Minister of State says another thing. To my understanding, the CBI investigation or inquiry was launched into the backdating of the letter of credit which was opened when the import policy for PTA was changed and it has nothing to do at all with what is commonly referred to as the 'Reliance Loan Mela.' etc. I, therefore, now like to come to the aspect of the 'Reliance Loan Mela' in which there are two kinds of loans, which are also contained in the notice for our discussion today There are two kinds of loans which we are examining. One are the loans given to the Indian companies for investing in the purchase of the "F" Series debentures of M|s. Reliance Industries, and the other is the loans given to certain non-resident Indians or NRIs, individuals or corporate, for investing in the same series of debentures. Now, our concern is whether, in these two categories of loans, the laid-down or established guidelines of the Reserve Bank of India have been adhered to or followed or have not been adhered to. Here, I would take this opportunity to examine the two assertions of the honourable Minister that these loans were "need-based" and that they had the authorisation or the sanction of the Reserve Bank of India I would, therefore, first like to read out just one or two guidelines of the Reserve Bank of India on the subject It is the guideline of the Reserve Bank of India. One of them says: Bank should be more concerned with what advances are for rather what advances are against. This is a very sound, categorical and explicit guideline. Secondly, Sir: Any advance against primary security of shares and debentures should be kept distinct and separate, and not combined with any other advance. Again, very specific. "No advance against the security of partly paid shares will be granted". And this has some relevance when it comes to NRI loans. Then: Banks should exercise particular care that advances are sought against large blocks of shares—by inference presumebly also debentures here—by a borrower or a group of borrowers to ensure that such advances are not utilised for other than short term productive purposes. "It should be ensured that advances against shares are not used to enable the borrower to acquire or retain a controlling interest in the company, copanies", etc. I am not reading all the guidelines. I am reading the relevant ones. Next, which is relevant: Whenever the limit exceeds Rs. 100,000 it should be ensured that shares|debentures are transferred in the bank's name — are transferred. The requirement is categorical. Then. Advance exceeding Rs. 5 lakhs against shares|debentures, etc. should be sanctioned by Board Committee of Directors. Advances against primary security of shares|debentures may be given only, for instance, to investment companies.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL) in the Chair] One important guideline, Sir which is very important when it comes to NRI: The objective of the various NRI deposits, non-resident deposits—an investment scheme is essentially to attract genuine savings of the on-resident Indians and all banks should ensure mobilisation of only this kind of enduring fund which is facilitated under the scheme. Another bank operating should not be a party to transactions such as making an advance or issuing back-up guarantees, etc.

I will come to the specific violations of these guidelines in one minute, in which task I am considerably assisted by the Rangarajan Committee's report. It has been laid on the Table of the House. Whatever I am quoting are the findings of this committee about the types of loans. I think it bears the indulgence of the House to recognise what the RBI itself has found about the types of loans granted by various banks. Between July and November 1985 banks gave loans aggregating to Rs. 76.04 crores to 81 parties in India. Besides advances aggregating to US dollars 35.1 million were also granted by overseas branches of all Indian banks. Then it goes into explaining the debenture scheme of RIL, on which I do not want to take up the time of the House at

[Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal]

the present moment. It gives a break-down Out of the amounts of loans granted to sompanies associated with Reliance Industries Ltd. Rs. 59.98 crores, wihch means, Rs. 60 crores, were given to companies associated with RIL. Now. here it is necessary for me, Sir, to read out the conclusion of the Rangarajan Committee. It says that the overseas branches of the Bank of Baroda have granted advance this much to about 236 non-resident Indians of Indian nationality or origin and 66 companies predominantly of non-resident Indians for acquirig L series of debentures of RIL. Then it goes on to Canara Bank, etc. This was the type of loan granted. About the nature of these companies to whom these loans were granted, both domestic as also foreign, it says that it is necessary to make a detailed analysis of the character and nature of the borrowing companies, their connections with the RIL and the nature and types of business carried out by them. It is necessary for establishing the Minister's statement that the loans granted were need-based. The RIL itself has classified 43 borrowing companies into two groups, Promotor Associates and Trader Associates. The Promotor Associate were also a subsidiary of another Promotor Associate called Mac. Investment which was incorporated sometimes in 1974 and the other companies had been incorporated in 1981 or later. The capital base of most of these companies which borrowed roughly 100 crores of rupees was such that 11 companies were having a capital of only Rs. 10,000. This is the nature of the companies, Sir. The Rangarajan Committee itself has reported that "The sale of a substantial part of the holding the Promoters Associates to the Trade Associates had enabled them borrow large amounts from banks." Again a violation. The Committee notes that the Banking Commission, in its report submitted in 1972, had envisaged that the criteria of genuine investment companies should be, etc. etc. and then it goes to outline what that criteria ought to be. Then it also goes to rule that the bank had, at the instance of the Reserve Bank, obtained a statement of sales, purchase and securities, yarn, fabrics, etc. and found that upon examination of these statements it was revealed that none of the 11 Promoters Associates, not one of the 11 Promoters Associates, had ever undertaken the business of trading in yarn and fabric. The main business of the Trade Associates, it is claimed, was precisely this, i.e. dealing in yaru and fabrics. The banace-shaeets of the companies do not indicate any holding of the stock. It seems that when the products pass on from the RIL to the ultimate buyer, such transactions are routed through the borrowing company.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL): Please try to conclude.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I will try very hard, Sir. About the purpose of the loan, whether it is need-based or not, the Rangarajan Committee has said firstly that "we find that no attempt was made to find out all the relevant informaion about the purpose of the loan." Then it goes on to say that "the banks which let this money had neither obtained relevant data nor made any analysis before sanctioning loans." It goes on further to say about the point whether it is for expansion or for production purposes, the Committee finds that" none of the banks had undertaken a review of the production part or the expansion part for the loans applied." It is the Committee's view that the Trade Associates and even the Promoters Associates did not qualify as investment companies in the true sense of the term. Here again the Minister's statement that the purpose of the grant of loan was need-based or it was for production purposes is not true. In fact, it is contradictory. Thereafter, about the procedure of granting loans, I will quote just one sentence about the procedure which the Rangarajan Committee has found. It says:

> "The applications did not generally give full particulars, and several columns in the applications had been left blank. There was hardly any detailed examination of the proposals at these offices or at the head office. Repayment schedules by the borrowing companies had been accepted without making any scrutiny."

Sir, about the end use of the funds... (*Time bell rings*) Just two minutes, Sir. There too, the Rangarajan Committee has found that the end use has not been adhered to. (*Interruptions*) I find it difficult, Sir, why the Treasury Benches, specially after the Prime Minister has stated here categorically that he is against wrong doings.....

AN HON. MEMBER: When the Prime Minister assured you, why do you raise this again?
(*Interruptions*)

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I will come, Sir, to the NRI investment. Here, Sir, there is also violation of the RBI directive. I find it necessary, Sir, to read out just that portion of the RBI directive... (*Interruptions*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL): I am afraid we would not be able to complete it this way. You have to be very brief....

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I will be very brief, Sir, because this directive is very brief. It says about 'loans abroad against securities provided in India'. And it specifically says that whenever loans are granted, shares and debentures of Indian companies held by Non-resident Indians— it is categorical the shares and debentures against the collateral or security of which loans are granted must be held at the time of granting of these loans. These shares or debentures held must be lodged with the bank as collateral or security, that the loan must not be granted for the sake of purchasing debentures, and that is the single most vital aspect of roughly Rs. 44 crores which was granted to these NRI companies. Now, Sir, in addition to the fact that there is a violation of the Reserve Bank guideline itself in the purpose of granting the loans, there are certain other violations that have taken place, categorical violations... (*Time bell rings*) I appeal to you, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, to be a bit considerate on this. Dont't be bullied by your own partymen.. (*Interruptions*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL): You have taken 22 minutes. I am conscious of the time. And that is what I have to be. (*Interruptions*)

AN HON. MEMBER: He has already taken 25 minutes in the half-an hour discussion.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL): Half-an-hour discussion should actually mean half an hour. But we have....(*interruptions*)

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I find the agitation on their part in fact intriguing but also somewhat amusing, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: This is the third time that you have raised the issue.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Sir, I would like to go into the aspects of the nature of the NRI companies. In the nature of the NRI companies, as a number of Members have earlier pointed out, there are aspects of this NRI investment which intrigue me. Firstly, the negotiations for these NRI loans were all conducted in India. Secondly, the loans were made abroad by the Bank of Baroda and other banks up to £ 220,000 which is roughly $ 350,000 at that time to companies with a paid up capital of as little as £ 2000 each. Sir, it is very intriguing that all these companies which were based in Panama which, my eminent colleague, Shri Appasaheb has always pointed out had names from all the mythical deities of Hindudom, had names from Sandhya Mantra and Ganesh Stotra and all those kinds of things. And all these Companies not only had nominal capital but they also had the same officers as President, as Treasurer, and as Secretary. And all these Companies have the same address which is Post Office Box No. 1961 of Dubai. And it is known, Sir, that the President, the Treasurer, and the Secretary of these NRI Companies have direct links with the RIL. Indeed, the negotiations were also conducted here in Bombay with the RIL (Time bellings) I will just come to two or three specific questions on the total aspect of it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL): Let there be only questions, please .

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: It is only questions, Sir.

Now, Sir, I am intrigued. So, along with all these questions that are implicit in what I have already asked I would request the Hon. Minister of State, Mr. Brham Dutt, to stand up and say what he had to say...

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM AND NATURAL GAS AND THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI BRAHM DUTT): I say these Members have also a right to express their views. If you take half an hour.... (*Interruptions*).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: Please maintain your cool.

SHRI BRAHM DUTT: What is your point in shouting at me.(*Interruptions*).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL): Please conclude now.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I am concluding. Sir, I state and I challenge the Hon. Minister of State, Shri Brahm Dutt, to deny it and I demand of the Government to investigate whether it is not a fact that loans were negotiated for non-resident Indian companies in India by the maagement of Reliance Industries Ltd, that the rates of interest were fixed, margins were determined and the security conditions agreed upon in India on behalf of the borrowers whose identity is known to the Government. Secondly, Sir, in the case of Bank of Oman, which had advanced Rs. 6 crores, it was then the Middle East Coordinator of Reliance Industries who sent the list of borrowers to the Bank of Oman, the bank did not even appear to have seen the fact of the borrowers. Please clarify this. Thirdly, Sir, in the case of Bank of Baroda which had advanced an excess of Rs. 34 crores, the advances were made to all these companies which had a share capital of as little as £ 100. Next, Sir, that the bank lending was only for the purpose of financing and securing subscription to the 'F' series of debentures of Reliance Industries Limited which were originally issued, and finally also issued as non- convertible debentures. I would like to know from the Government whether Rs. 44 crores of the moneys of nationalised banks have gone into non-resident Indian companies? How much of it is actually invested in debentures? Were these investments made after these debentures had come out or for the sake of purchasing of these debentures? were the RBI guidelines strictly followed in the case of investments made of loans granted to the Indian companies, as also to the non-resident Indian companies? I conclude, Sir, by advising the Hon. Minister of State that as the Prime Minister in this very context has stood up here and said that the wrong-doer will not be let past and guilty will be punished as, your own committees have identified the guilty, have identified who have committed the wrong, please stand up and say what action you intend taking against a fraud on such a massive scale, a fraud not only against the banknig system but a fraud against the entire total system of goverance of the country. Nothing less than that would satisfy me here; as long as the Government did not come forward and categorically state what action it now wants to take. Thank you.

SHRI BRAHM DUTT: One point I want to clarify. My colleague, Shri Poojari will be replying to this discussion. The Hon. Member had referred to me. I have just to reiterate what the Prime Minister has said on April 23. He said and I repeat and I reiterate that that is the Government's stand. If I may just add to that that I do not want to go into the technicalities of the issue. If there is any violation of laws or regulation of norms, nobody will be allowed to go free. The cases will be taken to their logical conclusion and the Government will not protect or reduce the punishment in any way

at all. That is the policy of the Government. This applies to the cases now being investigated by the CBI, the RBI or show cause notice given by the Customs Officer and again I repeat that we are non-aligned in the war of industrial houses and we are not biassed against anybody and we are not pro anybody.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Will this be followed up by action?

SHRI BRAHM DUTT: This will be followed up by action.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL): There should be no such discussion now. Hon. Minister, Shri Poojari, please.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Would the hon. Minister come forward and say as to when the action will follow?

(*Interruptions*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL): The Minister will now reply to the points raised by the initiator of the discussion, Shri Jaswant Singh. After that, hon. Members will seek clarifications. I repeat 'clarifications'.

SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA (Gujarat): Sir, Members should be allowed to make their points. Then, at the end, the hon. Minister will reply.

(*Interruptions*)

THE VICE-CHIARMAN (SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL): This is not the procedure. Now, the hon. Minister please.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI JANARDHAN POOJARI): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the hon .Member had put a Starred Question. If I may be permitted to read this question, it reads as follows: "whether after the initiation of a CBI enquiry against M|s. Reliance Industries Limited, any institutional or banking credit has been granted to this concern; (b) It so, what are the details in this regard"— This was Starred Question No. 123. It was answered on the 23rd April, 1987. The answer was "CBI had registered a case on....

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: This we all know.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL): Let him complete.

SHRI JANARDHAN POOJARI: "CBI had registered a case on 18-11-85 against the management of Reliance Textile Industries Limited, Reliance Industries Limited and some officials of Government of India regarding alleged back dating of Letters of Credit and leakage of information about impending change in import policy". This is regarding letters of credit and also leakage of information about impending change in import policy and this case is against the Reliance Industries Limited. That was the pertinent question put by the hon. Member on that day. Therefore, I have to confine...

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Not at all.

SHRI JANARDHAN POOJARI: Please hear me. I have great regard for you. I did not interrupt you.

Sir, here, the hon. Member has to make a distinction between the Reliance Industries Limited and a case pertaining to the Reliance Industries Limited. What is the issue? why did the CBI register a case? What is the difference between enquiry and investigation? What is the difference between enquiry and investigation after the registration of the case? Sir, the hon. Member is a well-read man. He is an experienced Parliamentarian. Unfortunately, he has created a confusion. This is regarding a particular issue, regarding letters of credit issued, pre-dated or ante-dated, and also leakage of information about the impending change in the import policy. We have to confine to that. But what did he do on that day? He put some question regarding the associated companies connected with the Reliance Industries; he referred to the Rangarajan Committee and the loans given to these associated companies. This means, instead of putting the question in respect of A, he but the question in respect of B.

[Shri Janardhan Poojari]

In supplementaries, he put the question in respect of B and about their transactions. As I said, this question is relating to A, but the hon. Member put the question in respect of B. The question is where I should answer this. I have not created any confusion here. Unfortunately, the confusion has come from his side. Here you are putting the blame on me saying that I have confused the issue. The entire issue was quite different. Rangarajan Committee was in respect of some other issue, in respect of some investment companies and trading companies connected with Reliance. For example 'B' is investigating something in the shares of 'A', you have to put the question in respect of 'B', whereas you have put the question in respect of 'A'. So, that question I answered. Now what is the question? There is some confusion about enquiry and investigation. Here the case has been registered as per the Criminal Procedure Code. Investigation starts as soon as the case is registered. As soon as the case is registered, a copy of the FIR is sent to the court. Investigation starts. When the investigation is in progress and is completed, it has to be filed before the court. It is the legal term and in the legal sense I am speaking. Until and unless the final report, whether it is the chargesheet or other report, is filed before the court, the investigation is not complete.. In that term I have stated on that day. Only after the chargesheet or the gnal report is filed, this trial begins in a court of law. What have I stated on that day? Final report under section 173 is not filed. It is not yet completed. Hence in legal terms I have stated, until it is filed in legal terms, the investigation is not complete. Before that if some reference is made to some higher authority, i,e before the investigation was completed or it could be done before that. Once again it could be reopened or it could be in progress before the final report is filed. That also I have said. Now you put the blame on me saying that the entire issue was confused by me. Whatever was answered by me related to this letter of credit and to the CBI enquiry. I have not answered your single question regarding Rangarajan Committee or regarding the associated companies on that day, because I should be relevant and I should be very careful. When the hon. Members are like that, very efficient, you will put me in trouble and you will have a privilege motion against me also if I committed a little mistake or even if while uttering some words I was not careful. So, I was very careful. I did not touch anything about the associated companies. Now, Sir, today also this Half-an-Hour Discussion relates to that letter of credit and investigation.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Will the hon. Minister of State yield for a minute? Here he is factually wrong. All that is required to be done is to refer to the notice of a Half-an Hour Discussion and it will be established what the hon. Minister of State has stated is factually incorrect. Please send for the notice and please have a look at it because what the hon. Minister of State is saying is factually incorrect. Please examine the three issues that the Chairman has given me the permission to raise. Please examine that. Please correct the hon. Minister of State because the three issues granted by hon. Chairman are specific. The three issues mentioned therein are specific, loan to the Indian companies NRI, and RBI directives. That is the specific mandate that was required. I was required to inform the Chairman what points I wish to raise. That Chairman has granted me permission on specific points. Please read them out so that the hon. Minister of State knows what the Chairman has granted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL): If necessary, I will read out the points referred to by the hon. Member to the Chairman. If the Minister wants to say something, it is up to him.

SHRI JANARDHAN POOJARI : What is in the agenda, besides....

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : The agenda you don't have to show him. The points which an hon. Member really takes to the Chairman are sent to the Minister and I presume the Minister knows of those points. Please read them out. I beg of you to read them out.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL): I think the Minister knows the points.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Because he has made a statement contrary to that, I would beg of you to read them out.

SHRI JANARDHAN POOJARI : I have not made any contrary statement. I am just saying....You don't have the patience also. Please hear me. I have referred to the Starred Question and you have stated that I have confused it. That is why I said it.

Now coming to your Half-an-Hour Discussion, now what is the agenda item. I am just reading the wording:

"Shri Jaswant Singh to raise a discussion on points raising out of the answer given in the Rajya Sabha on the 23rd April, 1987, to Starred Question 123, regarding credit to M/s. Reliance Industries Ltd."

It is confined to Reliance Industries Ltd.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: No, Sir.

SHRI JANARDHAN POOJARI: Please hear me. So now this is the agenda paper, this is the List of Business. Whether I have to go beyond it or I have to answer whatever points you have raised, I leave it to the Chair.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, just on that point of order. Here a substantial point has been raised by the hon. Minister of State. It is a substantial point of order. The hon. Mininter of State avers that in today's List of Business, the Half-an-Hour Discussion is described in certain terms; therefore he finds himself confined and bound by the description contained in the List of Business. My submission is....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL) : I have got your point, let me see the notice first.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Let me take a second, please. My submission is, that at the time of giving notice of the Half-an-Hour Discussion, we are bound under the Rules of Procedure of the Rajya Sabha to state what are the points we are going to raise. The Chairman has examined the points that I am going to raise and the Chairman has granted me sancion to raise those points. If now the hon. Minister of State stands up and says "I am not recognising the points that you have made to the Chairman on which you have been granted permission, I am going to go by today's List of Business", then I think we are committing a grave wrong to the Rules of Procedure of this House. Please rule on that.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI (MAHARASHTRA): Sir, may I make a point of submission? I would request Mr. Poojari that he is wrong in understanding the procedure. If you refer to the Rule of Procedure, there is a para on Half-an-Hour Discussion. It is stated there it should relate to a recent question—Starred or Unstarred and the format is there, we have to apply in this format. This is the format: I hereby give notice of my intention to raise a Half-an-Hour Discussion on the question of loan granted to various Indian companies connected with M|s. Reliance Industries Ltd. etc. etc. arising out of answer given to Starred Question No. 123 and I will make the following points: This notice is sent to the Ministry of Finance in which you are the boss. Your officer and you yourself must have gone through these points. Now you are barring the Members.... I have not completed, Mr. Poojari.

SHRI JANARDHAN POOJARI: Sir, I respect the hon. Member. He has stated that I have made a wrong statement. You have said that I am making a wrong statement.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: No, you have wrongly understood.

SHRI JANARDHAN POOJARI: What I have stated is, I leave it to the Chair, If the Chair says...

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: It is not in the hands of the Chair now. It is already accepted. The notice is accepted and the Chairman has already sanctioned the discussion. Nobody now can chage it. And

[Shri A. G. Kulkarni]

this is the format and these are the questions. I think the Vice-Chairman will bear me out. Perhaps the Secretariat will advise him.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Sir I appeal to you. A substantial point has arisen. The fact of the matter is that this sanction has been granted by the Chairman. It is not for the honourable Minister of State or the Vice-Chairman to now change it. You will be doing a grave wrong about the procedures of this House.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL): I have considered the points raised by Mr. Jaswant Singh. In the notice submitted by any Member to the Chairman, the Member concerned has to mention the points which he wishes to raise during the Half-an-Hour Discussion. It is a matter of fact that Mr. Jaswant Singh did mention three points considering which the Chairman has permitted this matter to be raised in the House. Thereafter, the House as such goes by the List of Business, that is, the agenda mentioned there. The points on which the honourable Member was asking for a discussion are the points which he has to raise to enable the Chairman to take a decision on the notice. Thereafter the Minister elucidates the answer given by him in reply to the main question. I would, therefore, hold that it is for the Minister to reply to the debate the way he likes.

SHRI JANARDHAN POOJARI: Sir, about my statement—which has been referred to as a "contradictory statement" by the honourable Member—I wish to say that I have made the statement correctly regarding Reliance Industries Limited. Nowhere had I touched the points raised by him in respect of the loans given to the associated companies; it was a subject-matter of the Rangarajan Committee. Regarding the action taken against the associated companies, as soon as the inquiry report came to the Government from the Reserve Bank of India, that is, the first preliminary inquiry, it was placed before the House. We did not conceal or suppress anything. Even after that, when the Reserve Bank appointed the Rangarajan Committee, in respect of the associated companies also the report was placed before the House, and that honourable Member has gone into details of it and he placed certain facts also. The Rangarajan Committee has gone into that and they have stated—it I am permitted to read it out—in the last para:

> "In sum the loans granted have been secured and profitable from the point of view of banks. The repayments in the loans have been generally regular so far. However, banks fail to adhere strictly to the guidelines of the Reserve Bank of India in determining the purpose and quantum of loans."

We have taken action, we have recalled the loans. For the benefit of the honourable Member, the outstanding balance as on 28-8-1986 was Rs. 37.82 crores. We have recalled it and only Rs. 8.94 crores are left to be paid.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Why even that?

SHRI JANARDHAN POOJARI: That will also be recovered. All other loans have been recalled. Some time has to be given—two, three or four months. Immediately nobody will be in a position to pay back, because they were otherwise expected to pay back the loans on due dates only. Now it has been paid. Action has been taken. It is nobody's case that action will not be taken. Not only that. The honourable Member is aware of the fact that here in this CBI case also you are under the impression that there was an inquiry. There was no enquiry. The FIR was registered, the case was registered, investigation started. We did not support any person or unit. We are non-aligned as stated by the hon. Minister, Mr. Brahm Dutt. We are not interested in anybody. We want to take action. Prime Minister has made it very clear that action would be taken. Nobody will be spared. Nobody will go scot-free, and this policy is followed in its letter and spirit.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Neither in letter nor in spirit.

SHRI JANARDHAN POOJARI: Please. Now you are feeling that we have to expedite the investigation and action should be taken. I will convey that feeling also. For your information I can tell you, the final report will be filed under section 173. We will also see that the final report is expedited. To that extent also we promise you. Nobody will be spared if found guilty. Otherwise, nobody can take action. Even I cannot take action.

You don't be under the impression that we want to suppress. I thank you for coming before the House with this question, and we have got an opportunity to tell Parliament what action we have taken so far. So, wherever there is violation of the guidelines, we have already stated that action would be taken, and we have taken action earlier also. If there is any violation, whether it is under the FERA or in any other area, we will take action. That assurance, I will give to you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL): Before I call the hon. speakers, I have to point to the rule once again that after the statement of the Minister is only questions which the hon. Members can ask. Mr. A. G. Kulkarni.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: Sir, I will only seek some clarification, particularly in view of the notice of the Half-an-Hour Discussion which I also signed, regarding adherence to the RBI guidelines in respect of NRI loans abroad and follow-up action in respect of the borrower and the lending institution.

If I remember rightly, in 1984 myself, and Mr. Morarka at that time, when Mr. Pranab Mukherjee was the Finance Minister and the scheme of the NRI investment was introduced, objected that this would open the floodgates for bringing in under-invoice, over-invoice money into this country. I am totally satisfied with what the Prime Minister has replied here that this Government is not going to shield anybody whether it is this industrial house or that industrial house and particularly the industrial house which has brought this Government into trouble. That I can understand.

Sir, the Rangarajan Committee has rightly pointed out—you have read the summary—and has come to the conclusion that the RBI guidelines for the FERA investment as enunciated by Mr. Venkataraman on the 8th of August, 1982 when he was the Finance Minister, have been flouted. I want a categorical assurance now because the Prime Minister has already stated. You say that the money has been recalled. Mr. V. P. Singh had assured this House. To my information, the money granted in India, a major part of it, might have been repaid or recalled, whatever it is. Sir, I want a specific answer because my information is something different. Out of Rs. 44 crores Rs. 34 was by the Bank of Baroda, Rs.6 crores was by the Bank of Oman and certain small items. I would like to know how much foreign exchange was recalled because this was granted for purchase of debentures—F Series or non-convertible debenutres. It was a very strategic move by Mr. V. P. Singh when he was the Finance Minister. He banned this conversion. That is why this company came into trouble and their shares were tumbling. I want to know very specifically how much has been recalled out of these foreign loans?

I want to have clarification on other two points. These loans under the RBI guidelines were to create assets. It seems the Bank of Baroda and the Bank of Oman have faulted. They have given assumed debentures which are going to be foated. From this money that was going to be purchased by front companies of the RIL registered in the Isle of Man. For your information you enquire this through your Enforcement Directorate. One Mr. Shah, who has a 30,000 dollar invesment, has invested 7 million dollars in the RIL debentures. Is it a fact? I want to know that. Perhaps you may not be having information now. You can place it on the Table later on. Mr. Brahm Dutt categorically stated in the

[Shri A. G. Kulkarni]

morning that the misuse of the NRI investment has come to the notice of the Government and the Governmen is reviewing it. But the point is that there is stock exchange manipulation, the gifts of NRI debenures to various newspaper editors or politicians or even to persons who have got nothing to do, but who are the bureaucrats in the Government, including the CBI, who have got these, I want to ask? The Prime Minister has stated on this, but the people must see that justice is done. It is not only that you are going to do justice. The assurance of the Prime Minister must be transformed into practice. Precept must be transformed into practice. I would like to know out of Rs. 44 crores worth of loans granted, how much has been repaid or how much money has been called back? If it has not been done, when will it be called back? Secondly, I would like to know whether you are going to adhere to precepts and practice, because there is a total rumour in the market that the RIL is successful in confusing the Government and in creating in our own party two parties attacking one another. Bureaucrats are all enjoying. So, let us be very fair to ourselves and get to the root of the cause.

✓SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Well said.

SHRI VITHALBHAI MOTIRAM PATEL (Gujarat): I want to know from the hon. Minister what were the reasons to change the longterm policy for 1983 to 1985 within a month of its announcement? From which lobby was there pressure? What was the interest of the bureaucrats in the Finance Ministry to change the policy within a month which was declared for three years—1983-86? What is the main reason behind this?

Secondly, are there any companies who have faulted the RBI loans and has any action been taken against them also?

Thirdly, I would like to know whether there is any conspiracy to destabilise the economy and to create frustration among the investors and entrepreneurs like the efforts that are being made to destabilise the country. I would like to know whether the Minister will go into these things. Another thing, Sir, hon. 6.00 P.M Member, Mr. Jaswant Singh mention about £ 2,000 share and £ 1,000 share holding companies. Even Mr. Goenka has got share worth of Rs. 1,000 only but he controls the Indian Express which is holding Rs. 45 crores company. We are talking about £ 1,000 and £ 2,000 share holding companies which is more than Rs 1,000 worth of shares Thank you.

**श्री कल्पनाथ राय** (उत्तर प्रदेश) : आदरणीय उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, प्रधान मंत्री जी ने इस सदन में कहा था जसवंत सिंह जी के प्रश्न के जवाब में कि कोई भी उद्योगपति हो, जो गलती करेगा उसके खिलाफ हमारी सरकार कड़ी से कड़ी कार्यवाही करेगी। अब प्रधान मंत्री के उत्तर के बाद यह तीसरी बार, आदरणीय जसवंत सिंह जी यहां पर हाफ-एन-आवर डिसकशन लाये हैं, तीसरी बार। दुनिया इस बात को जानती है, इस बात को छिपाया नहीं जा सकता कि यह दो उद्योगपतियों के बीच में जीवन और मरन की लड़ाई चल रही है। एक है बाम्बे डाइंग और एक है रिलायंस इंडस्ट्रीज। बाम्बे डाइंग के जो प्रोप्राइटर हैं, वह विदेशी सिटीजन हैं, वह हिंदुस्तान के सिटीजन नहीं हैं* . . . के नाती हैं और जसवंत सिंह की पार्टी के राष्ट्रीय उपाध्यक्ष श्रीमती विजयाराजे सिंधिया का सब से बड़ा शेयर बाम्बे डाइंग में है, जिसकी वकालत करने यह तीसरी बार आये हैं। मैं यह कह रहा हूं कि देश की जनता इस बात को जानना चाहती है, रिलाएंस इंडस्ट्री में चालीस लाख के शेयर (**व्यवधान**)

✓**श्री जसवंत सिंह** : यदि आप मुझे आज्ञा दें (**व्यवधान**) इनकरेक्ट बात कर दी है . . . (**व्यवधान**) आप अगर आज्ञा दें, तो एक करेक्शन कर दूं। . . . (**व्यवधान**)

**उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री पवन कुमार बांसल)** कल्पनाथ राय जी, एक मिनट ठहरिये।

*Not recorded.

**श्री जसवंत सिंह:** इसमें माननीय सदस्य जो कहना चाहें, उनको पूरी छूट है ... **(व्यवधान)**

**श्री कल्पनाथ राय :** आप जो कहना चाहें, उसकी छूट है ... **(व्यवधान)** इनका जवाब मैं दूंगा और कोई नहीं देगा। ... **(व्यवधान)**

**श्री जसवंत सिंह :** मेरा एक ही निवेदन है कि जहां यह उल्लेख किया गया है कि श्रीमती विजया राजे सिंधिया बाम्बे डाइंग में मेजर शेयर होल्ड करती हैं, वह शायद फैक्चयुली करेक्ट नहीं है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL): Pleose don't take names. Don't record names.

**श्री कल्पनाथ राय :** यह तो मंत्री जी जवाब देंगे ना ... **(व्यवधान)**

**उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री पवन कुमार बांसल) :** कल्पनाथ राय जी एक मिनट इनको बोलने दीजिए।

**श्री जसवन्त सिंह :** यह फैक्चुयली करेक्ट नहीं है और बाकी वह जो लांछन लगाना चाहें, वह और श्री ब्रहम दत्त जी दोनों खड़े होकर लगा दें। ब्रहम् दत्त जी बैठे-बैठे हंस कर न लगायें तो अच्छा रहेगा... **(व्यवधान)**

**श्री कल्पनाथ राय :** चालीस लाख शेयर हैं रिलाएंस इंडस्ट्री के—लड़ाई किस बात की है, यह देश को और दुनिया को भी जाननी चाहिए। बाम्बे डाइंग* विदेशी नागरिक डी०एम०टी० प्लांट लगाये हुए हैं, रिलाएंस इंडस्ट्रीज के मालिक *पी०टी०ए० की आधुनिकतम टैक्नालोजी लाकर हिंदुस्तान में प्लांट लगा रहे हैं जिससे जो रामैटीरियल बनेगा, वह चीपर होगा, सस्ता होगा बनिस्बत डी०एम०टी० के। इसी डी०एम०टी० और पी०टी०ए के झगड़े में गला काट प्रतियोगिता चल रही है। अगर पी०टी०ए० का रा-मैटीरियल बनेगा, तो विदेश से हम अरबो करोड़ों का सामान जो खरीद रहे हैं, पी०टी०ए० वह हिंदुस्तान को नहीं खरीदना पड़ेगा। सवाल है कि यह पार्लियामेंट हिंदुस्तान के पूंजिपतियों के मुकाबले विदेशी पूंजीपतियों को प्रायटी देगी या हिंदुस्तान के पूंजिपतियों को देगी* बाम्बे डाइंग, वह डी०एम०टी प्लांट रखने वाला क्या ती०टी०ए० को बनाने देगा या नहीं, इन्हीं सारे मामलों को लेकर इंडियन एक्सप्रेस के* और श्रीमती विजया राजे सिंधिया और उनके साथी, वित्त मंत्रालय में* ...**(व्यवधान)**

**उपसभाध्यक्ष श्री पवन कुमार बांसल) :** कल्पनाथ राय जी, जो हाऊस के मेम्बर नहीं हैं, उनके नाम मत लीजिए। नाम मत लिखिये।

**श्री कल्पनाथ राय :** पूरे हिन्दुस्तान के अंदर एक साजिश चला कर के इन लोगों ने पूरे राष्ट्र की इकानमी को डीस्टैबेलाईज करने की कोशिश की है और यह सारा सदन ... **(व्यवधान)**

**श्री जसवंत सिंह :** जो सरकारी अफसर हैं ... **(व्यवधान)** दूसरे राजनीतिज्ञों का तो ... **(व्यवधान)**

**उपसभाध्यक्ष श्री पवन कुमार बांसल) :** कल्पनाथ राय जी, एक सैकंड उनकी बात सुन लेने दीजिए।

**श्री जसवंत सिंह :** वह चाहें तो राजनीतिज्ञों का नाम लें और जो उनके मन मे आए, वह कहें, पर जो सरकारी कर्मचारी हैं ... **(व्यवधान)**

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL): I have given him the permission to speak.

**श्री जसवंत सिंह:** जो सरकारी कर्मचारी हैं, माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि वह राजनीतिज्ञों के बारे में और श्री ब्रह्म दत्त जी भी जो चाहे हमको गाली दे दें, परन्तु जो

*Not recorded.

[श्री जसवंत सिंह]

सरकारी कर्मचारी हैं उनके बारे में सदन का यह नियम रहा है कि उन सरकारी कर्मचारियों का नाम से उल्लेख नहीं किया जाएगा । यह मेरा आपसे निवेदन है। ... (**व्यवधान**)

**श्री कल्पनाथ राय** : आदरणीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह बात कही जा चुकी हैं यहां पर कि श्री रामनाथ गोयनका के सुन्दर नगर हाउस में हमारे अधिकारी* को.... (**व्यवधान**)

**उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री पवन कुमार बांसल)** : कल्पनाथ जा, आप नाम लेकर नहीं, आप सिर्फ अपनी बात कीजिए ।

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: Please remove the names from the record.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL): The names of the people who are not members of the House would be removed from the record.

**श्री कल्पनाथ राय** : आदरणीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, पूरा हिन्दुस्तान जानता है कि अमरीका की फेयरफैक्स एजेंसी को नियुक्त कराने में यह बाम्बे डाइंग के मालिक बिल्कुल मैं कह रहा हूं, यह सब कहने पड़ेंगे ।.... (**व्यवधान**)

**उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री पवन कुमार बांसल)** : नाम नहीं आये । आप मालिक कहकर बात कर लीजिए ।

**श्री कल्पनाथ राय** : मुझे कहने दीजिए, आप जो चाहें निकाल दीजिए यह फेयरफैक्स एजेंसी जो सी०आई०ए० से लिंक्ड है, जो अमरीका के स्टेट डिपार्टमेंट से लिंक्ड थी, जो हमारे हिन्दुस्तान में पोलिटिकल डिस्टेबेलाइजेशन करना चाहते थे, इन सारी ताकतों ने मिलकर इसकी कोशिश की और हमारे देश में जिसकी जानकारी प्रधान मंत्री तक को नहीं थी। इससे बड़ा जनघात और राष्ट्रघात देश के इतिहास में और क्या हो सकता है? आप कहते हैं कि इस तरह के लोगों के नाम मत लीजिए तो फिर किसका नाम लिया जाए? जसवंत सिंह जी आप खड़े होकर तीन-तीन बार इस सदन के अंदर आधा-आधा घंटा समय प्रधान मंत्री जी के कहने के बावजूद जबकि उन्होंने कह दिया किसी पूंजीपति के खिलाफ हमारा कोई मतलब नहीं है, लेकिन जो गलत काम करेगा हम उसके खिलाफ कड़ी कार्यवाही करेंगे, लेकिन क्या यह बात सही नहीं है कि यह जो हमारे इंडियन एक्सप्रेस के एडवाइजर और यह हमारे वित्त मंत्रालय के दो-दो बड़े अधिकारी एक टाइकून के घर पर लगातार साल भर से मिलते रहे हैं और इन लोगों ने मिलकर फेयरफैक्स एजेंसी सी०आई०ए० से मिल करके एप्वायंट कराई जिसकी जानकारी प्रधान मंत्री तक को नहीं थी । जो पूरे हिन्दुस्तान के पोलिटीकल सिस्टम को डिस्टेबेलाइज करने की कोशिश कर रहे थे ।*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL): These references would be expunged.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: This should not go into the record.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL): It is not going into the record. I have already given a direction to that effect. Mr. Kalp Nath Rai, please confine yourself to clarifications.

आप अपनी बात इस तरीके से कीजिये कि कलैरीफिकेशन बने । ... (**व्यवधान**)

**श्री कल्पनाथ राय** : मैं पूछ रहा हूं कि क्या 40 लाख शेयरहोल्डर रिलायंस इंडस्ट्री में हैं ? क्या बोम्बे डाइंग का प्रोपराइटर विदेशी नागरिक है? क्या यह बात सही है कि राम नाथ गोयनका ने करोड़ों रुपया कर्जा लिया है? उस कर्जे में इनकी जो कंपनियां हैं इंडियन एक्सप्रैस, मदुरै, इंडियन एक्सप्रैस, बम्बई, आन्ध्र प्रभा प्राइवेट लि० एक्सप्रैस न्यूज पेपर्ज प्रा० लि० नारीमन प्वाइंट, एक्सप्रैस ट्रेडर्ज प्रा० लि०, कोलाबा आदि आदि ये जो 15—20 कंपनियां जो हैं उन्होंने कितना पैसा सरकारी बैंकों से लिया है ? उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, क्या यह बात सही है कि बम्बई और कलकत्ता के अंदर

*Not recorded.

फ्राड और फोर्जरी के केसेज इनके ऊपर चल रहे हैं? कभी आपने रामनाथ गोयनका के फ्राड और फोर्जरी के 420 के मामलों को उठाया है, जसवंत सिंह जी? क्या आपको दिन-रात केवल रिलायंस ही याद रहता है? आदरणीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, क्या यह सही है कि जो 56 या 60 करोड़ रुपया रिलायंस इंडस्ट्रीज की एसोसिएट कंपनियों ने लिया रिलायंस इंडस्ट्री ने नहीं लिया, क्या उन्होंने रुपया वापस कर दिया? क्या 10 करोड़ रुपया जो वर्किंग कैपिटल इन कपनियों के पास है, पूरे हिन्दुस्तान में जो चार-पांच सौ, हजार, दस हजार कंपनियां हैं क्या उनको वर्किंग कैपिटल बैंक देता है तो क्या इनको भी उसी रफ्तार से 10 परसेंट दिया गया है? क्या यह एसोसिएट कंपनियों को जो कर्जे दिए गए हैं, क्या वह कर्जे रिजर्व बैंक की रिपोर्ट के अनुकूल वापस हो गए हैं यह 90 परसेंट कर्जे? क्या वर्किंग कैपिटल ही उनके पास है? तो क्या आप बतला सकते हैं कि यह जो 15–20 रामनाथ गोयनका की कंपनियां हैं इनके पास सरकार का कर्जा है? और यह बतलाइए कि इनके ऊपर फ्राड-फोरजरी 420 के केसेज बम्बई, कलकत्ता आदि बड़ी-बड़ी जगहों पर चल रहे हैं।

आदरणीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, प्रधान मंत्री महोदय के ऐसा कहने के बावजूद भी कि हमारी सरकार किसी उद्योगपति के मामले में ढील नहीं लेगी। बार-बार विरोधी दल के आदरणीय सदस्य और विशेष रूप से जसवंत सिंह जी तीन-तीन बार इस एतराज को लेकर आए हैं। हर सेशन में, हर बार हमेशा एक कंपनी के हितों के पक्ष में इनका बोलना और दूसरी कंपनी के मालिक और उसके शेयर होल्डरों का गला काटना कहां तक उचित है। इसमें 40 लाख शेयर होल्डर हैं।

आदरणीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, पी०टी०ए० प्लांट बन जायगा तो विदेश से जो हम पी०टी०ए० मंगाते हैं, मंगाना रुक जायगा। यह जो विदेशी कंपनियों का वाइटल इंटरेस्ट है कि अगर पी०टी०ए० बन गया तो वह नहीं भेज पाएंगे और उन्हें जो करोड़ों-अरबो रुपया मुनाफा होता है वह नहीं मिल पायगा। इसी तरह डी०एम०टी० सोचता है कि पी०टी०ए० बन जाने से मेरे माल को कोई नहीं खरीदेगा। अब अगर इस तरह की टेक्नोलोजी लाने की अनुमति भारत सरकार ने दी है, तो एतराज क्यों है?

आदरणीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय मैं वित्त मंत्री महोदय से जानना चाहता हूं कि इस तरह का जो फारेन-नेशनल है, उस की सारी कंपनियों के खिलाफ वे सी०बी०आई० की जांच कराएंगे? क्या इस बात की जांच कराएंगे कि इनका विदेशी फेयरफैक्स या सी०आई०ए० से कोई लिंक है? क्या इन्होंने हिन्दुस्तान में पोलिटिकल डिस्टेब्लाइजेशन और रीजनल डिस्टेब्लाइजेशन करके हिन्दुस्तान की अर्थ-व्यवस्था को नष्ट करने की कोशिश नहीं की? यही मेरे आपसे सवाल हैं, जिनके मैं उत्तर चाहता हूं।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL): Now, Mr. Bir Bhadra Pratap Singh. Not here. Yes, Mr Chimanbhai Mehta.

SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA: My, Vice-Chairman, Sir, this House has always maintained its dignity while discussing even very sensitive issues and I hope we will not now turn the House into a cock-pit of business rivals and that is not our job.

Sir, Prime Minister Rajivji has made it very clear, has categoricall stated, that anybody, whosover it may be, violating the regulations of the FERA or any other regulations is going to be punished after investigation. This is the solemn assurance by the Prime Minister.

I may recall here that the RBI inquiry against M|s Reliance Industries was ordered by our Government, the recalling of loans was done by our Government and when the issue has come up like this, again it is our Government which is most

[Shri Chimanbhai Mehta]

categorical in saying that whosoever is guilty will be punished. Therefore, I welcome when the Opposition says that if there is something wrong, it should be investigated and the guilty should be punished.

But the Reliance issue was raised with Poojariji on the 23rd and we did not read the notice of Mr. Jaswant Singh because it was addressed to the Chairman and, naturally, we could not read it. Otherwise, we could also have said something about the credits by the banks, about the loans by the banks. I know that Kalpnathji was excited. But the relevant question is this: Are we discussing only one business house in this House? Why don't we discuss someone who it not an Indian national, but who is owing crores of rupees, who has take millions in loans and who has bought in the second hand DMT plant? What is the manufacturing cost and what is the price of the DMT? It is Rs. 21,000 per tonne. And, Sir, what is the international price? It is Rs 6,000 per tonne. Therefore, when we use these polyester fibre-polyester yarn, in our cloth Industry, our cloth becomes costlier and therefore, smuggling is open in the country. Who is responsible for this? Who gave the permission for the DMT plant? Who initiated it? It was done during the Janata regime and it was Mr. Nanaji Deshmukh who was responsible for initiating the whole process. All these facts should be laid bare. Why are we discussing only one business house? I know that quite a large number of the big business houses in our country are adopting wrong ethics. They would become multi-millionaires and billionaires. This should be investigated. Why should we defend one group? Why should we attack another group? This is not our business. And by doing this we are making this economy unviable. Foreign goods are coming. Smuggling is increasing. And by this the textile smuggling is not causing harm only to the textile industry; it is causing sickness to the industry. (Time Bell) Thousands of workers are getting unemployed. This has been done by people like Mr. Nusli Wadia and their political friends and patrons who may be sitting here and outside. They should also be exposed.

I believe in exposing this big business methods. Mr. Lalit Thapar was arrested. Questions were put in the House by our side. How many questions were put by the Opposition? Mr. Jaswant Singh was always alert about the ethics of the business houses. Did he ask any question about Lalit Thapar who was the disciple of Nanaji Deshmukh? No. (Time bell rings) This is one-sided way. I ask one clarification from Poojariji: Are you going to investigate only one company? It is good you are doing. We shall very soon have the final report. Prosecute the guilty. We would be very happy if that is done. Then, about other companies also this should be done. Kindly go ahead. Would you go ahead and also expose other companies with this to save Indian economy?

SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA (Uttar Pradesh): I have double in my mind whether the assurance given by the Prime Minister that the guilty will be punished, will be fulfilled, because, the person, the Leader of the House, who instituted an inquiry about Fairfax is out of the Ministry. Anyway, I have two questions to put. The Minister has admitted that the CBI inquiry was instituted on 18h November 1986, and it must have been instituted on the basis of some FIR. I would like to know the details of the FIR. And the Minister also stated that the CBI is investigating against the Reliance Industries and certain Government officials. I would like the Minister to inform us about the contents of the FIR and the designations of the Government officers involved.

SHRI JANARDHAN POOJARI: Sir, I would first answer the questions put by the last speaker. Sir, the case was registered on 18-11-85. There were voluminus records. There were witnesses to be quetioned. In the FIR nobody was mentioned as an accused. In the investigation the investigation officer has to identify the officials who are responsible for it and also the persons who have violated or committed the offeces. All these things will be known after the compoltion of the investigation when the final report is filled. Before that, if I say anything here, it

may hamper investigation. Not only that, if.....

SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA: On a point of order. I would like to refer to the reply given by the Minister on the 23rd of April. He said that the CBI registered a case on 18-11-85 against that management, the Reliance Textile Industries Ltd., and Referance Industries Ltd. and some officers of the Government of India. I have only asked about the designations of the officers.

SHRI JANARDHAN POOJARI: This is what I have said. No name has been mentioned in the FIR. It will be found out in the investigation. If the charge-sheet is filed, then the names will be disclosed. It will be known as to who are the persons responsible. All these things will be made known after the filing of the charge-sheet before the court. Not before that. So, when the charge-sheet will be filed, when any other report will be filed or when the final report will be filed....

SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA : You have said that the final report will be filed. It means that no case has been made out.

SHRI JANARDHAN POOJARI : The final report will be filed. If I say anything today, it may affect the investigation. Not only that. In the court of law, they may use my statement also. We want to take firm action and our statement should not be need tomorrow in the trial court in order to get benefit. Therefore, as I have stated last time, I am not going to make any statement in respect of the investigation. Our effort is to see that nobody goes scotfree and full action should be taken. Even in the court of law in the trial proceedings also proper action should be taken. For that purpose, I abstain myself from saying anything.

Now, Sir it is a statutory provision in the Banking Act as per the custom or usage that I should not disclose or no person should disclose any information relating to the constituents of a particular bank so many questions have been put. What is the amount given to so and so or to A, B, C or D things like that? I am not in a position to disclose anything in respect of the individual constituents and the details of their loans.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : They are there in the Rangarajan Committee Report.

SHRI JANARDHAN POOJARI: There we have placed everything. We have not concealed. Questions have been put against other people, Bombay Dyeing etc. Some names have been mentioned. I am not going to say anything. Regarding action to be taken against some other people, there is also a demand to look into that.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : I asked him specifically that as per Rangarajan Committee Report, 40 crores were.....

SHRI JANARDHAN POOJARI: I have have not completed. I have referred to some other Member's questions.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : As per your style, I am prepared to listen.

SHRI JANARDHAN POOJARI: Coming to the hon. Member's question, the Rangarajan Committee has gone into that aspect also. I think the hon. Member has gone into the report submitted by Rangarajan Committee. They have taken into consideration the statements of two banks the Bank of Baroda and the Canara Bank.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : And the Bank of Oman.

SHRI JANARDHAN POOJARI : I will come to that later. These loans were justified as an avenue for profitable deployment of surplus fund. They have given some other explanation. The Committee has stated that it finds it difficult to subscribe to the view about the relevant guidelines envisaged for grant of loans by banks for ab initio purchase of securities. The Committee interpretation is in keeping with the spirit of the scheme to attract genuine savings of non-resident Indians. However, the Bank has interpreted the circular to imply that loans would be given for initial subscription to depentures and shares even in 1982 after the issue of guidlines, as is seen from the Re-

[Shri Janardhan Poojari]

solution passed by the Board in October, 1982. Thereforce, to remove all doubts, it has since been clarified by the Reserve Bank of India. The Reserve Bank of India has given clarificatory guidelines. And then, Sir, the Rangarajan Committee left it there itself.

Sir, the advances made by the Indian bank branches abroad are subject to the rules and regulations prevailing in the respective countries of their operation. In the case of advances of foreign branches, they were utilised for the purpose for which the advances were given and hence they were not recalled. It is regarding foreign loans. Now, Sir, if the hon. Member gives me some more particulars about that, definitely I will look into that and I will write to him.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Sir, when the Minister of State says some more particulars, this is a valuable suggestion of the hon. Minister of State. If he could be a little more specific about what kind of particulars he wants, it shall be our endeavour to help to the extent that we can Certainly, if you are a little more specific about what particulars you want..

SHRI JANARDHAN POOJARI : Whatever information you give, it will be accepted by us, and we will look into it. And whatever nature of information you can give, it is going to help us. We do not want to suppress anything. We do not want to spare anybody. And that is why if you help us, definitely we will look into that.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : Mr. Minister, I had specifically referred to Rs. 44 crore NRI fund. You say that they are being operated under the laws of the Isle of Man or whatever it is. The Isle of Man is a tax haven. And, Sir, the money has come to India for investing because the Bank of Baroda and the Bank of Omen loaned to some fictitious companies like Lord Ganesha or Lord Venkatesh to invest in debentures. I want to specifically know from you whether these loans which have come to India have been recalled or not. I am not asking what the Isle of Man Government is doing. I do not want that information. Let them enjoy themselves. I am asking you this question. The money was brought into India for the purchase of 'F' series debentures. As per Mr. V. P. Singh's statement, the money which has not been found as need-based, that will be recalled. Have you recalled the foreign investors' loans. That is what I want.

SHRI JANARDHAN POOJARI : I made it clear in the statement also. The amounts have not been recalled. I have clearly stated why it was not recalled. I have stated that. I do not know whether you missed it. As I have stated earlier, we have not closed it. I am not saying that we have got a closed mind. Even the Prime Minister has made it very clear. And you also, if you got any further information, you can help us.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : About what?

SHRI JANARDHAN POOJARI: That is what I am just telling you. When you say that something wrong is done and you are not satisfied, if you give me some more information, we will look into that. Definitely we will not shut it down.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: The Rangarajan Committee has said that the RBI guidelines as issued in 1982 under FERA have been flouted. And these NRI companies, whichever they are, have been given loans by the Bank of Baroda and the Bank of Omen. The money was given in India itself for purchase of debetures. I am asking you whether you have recalled that. This is Indian money. I have not to give you further information. That is what I am asking.

SHRI JANARDHAN POOJARI: Rangarajan Committee has gone into that. Not only that. They have not drawn any adverse inference.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: They have.

SHRI JANARDHAN POOJARI: You kindly listen to me. They have left it there itself. Not only that. Why it is not recalled? In the case of money which was given inside the country, that was re-

called. And here we could have recalled, Sir. But as I stated earlier in my submission, the reason has also been given why it is not recalled. And if the hon. Member is not satisfied and if he gives me some more information, then I will look into that.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL): The House stands adjourned to meet at 11 a.m. on Monday, the 4th May, 1987.

The House then adjourned at thirty-minutes past six of the clock till eleven of the clock on Monday, the 4th May, 1987.